

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully solicited.

Claims 1, 7, 13, 15, 21, 27, and 57 are pending, with Claims 1 and 15 being independent. Claims 1, 7, 15, and 21 have been amended.

The drawings were objected to for the reasons on the grounds that Claim 15 was not amended on January 26, 2007, in the same manner as Claim 1. All objections are respectfully traversed, and are submitted to have been obviated by the amendment of Claim 15 in the manner that Claim 1 was previously amended, namely, Claim 15 now recites that the --printing apparatus-- (rather than the Web Server) can be accessed, and “from the Web server of the printing apparatus” (both instances) is changed to “from the printing apparatus” or the like (see, e.g., Figs. 1, 3, and 14).

Claims 1, 7, 13, 15, 21, 27, and 57 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over previously-cited U.S. Patent No. 6,170,007 B1 (Venkatraman, et al.) in view of newly-cited U.S. Patent No. 6,184,996 B1 (Gase) and previously-cited U.S. Patent No. 5,699,494 (Colbert, et al.). All rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 1 and 15 recite, *inter alia*, that the printing apparatus includes an operation unit, adapted to display an operation screen for allowing a user to operate said printing apparatus by entering a key on the operation screen, and the operation unit of the printing apparatus displays a message formed based on the message data (based on a character message input by the Web client) received by said reception unit, in accordance with the timing information (input by the Web client).

However, Applicant respectfully submits that none of Venkatraman, et al., Gase, and Colbert, et al., even in the proposed combinations, assuming, *arguendo*, that the documents could be combined, discloses or suggests at least the above-discussed claimed features as recited, *inter alia*, in Claims 1 and 15.

Applicant further respectfully submits that there has been no showing of any indication of motivation in the cited documents that would lead one having ordinary skill in the art to arrive at such features.

The dependent claims are also submitted to be patentable because they set forth additional aspects of the present invention and are dependent from independent claims discussed above. Therefore, separate and individual consideration of each dependent claim is respectfully requested.

This Amendment After Final Rejection is an earnest attempt to advance prosecution and reduce the number of issues, and is believed to clearly place this application in condition for allowance. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that a full appreciation of these amendments will not require undue time or effort given the Examiner's familiarity with this application. Moreover, this Amendment was not earlier presented because Applicant earnestly believed that the prior Amendment placed the subject application in condition for allowance. Accordingly, entry of this Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 is respectfully requested.

Applicant submits that this application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Daniel S. Glueck/
Daniel S. Glueck
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 37,838

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200
DSG/mcm

FCHS_WS 1466719v1